SOME NEW BOOKS.

Federal and State Government During the Civil War.

It would be hard to exaggerate the actual and prospective importance of the relations that were maintained between the Federal Government at Washington and the State Governments of loyal States during the four years of civil war. The subject has been treated in some detail, and with results highly creditable to the historian, by Mr. James Ford Rhodes; but it was by no means exhausted, and we are glad, therefore, to see it discussed from a somewhat different point of view in a volume entitled *War Government, Federal and State, in Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania and Indiana*, by WILLIAM B. WEEDEN, author of the "Economic and Social History of New England" (Houghton, Mifflin & Co.). Mr. Weeden tells us in an introduction that long ago he urged upon the investigators of the records of the civil war that there was a great field for the study of government in the interaction of the national Union and those State Commonwealths, which in many aspects were really principalities, especially in the early stages of the conflict with the Southern Confederacy. As no one else would undertake the task, he has essayed it himself. It is true, as he says, that the right functions of the partial powers of the petty sub-kingdoms exemplified in the States north of the Potomac and the Ohio were hardly perceived in 1861. It was known, of course, that the several States were not complete in sovereignty, any more than the United States, considered as a whole, was completely sovereign; but the magnitude of the attributes of sovereignty reserved to the States was by no means fully recognized. Debarred from coining money or levying war for themselves they undoubtedly were; but, as events were to demonstrate, they could levy war for the Union on the largest scale conceived at that time by any people, whether governed imperially or democratically. Those who were busy in putting down rebellious States seeking to form a new Confederacy forgot the importance of the mediatory principalities at the North. Because it was convenient for a bureau at Washington to put forth the national puissance, and levy on the whole body of loyal people, the bureaucrats were constantly overlooking the fact that the process was necessarily in a state of gestation. The central power of the Union, destined ultimately to stretch its imperial hand over every citizen, had to be developed slowly. As long, indeed, as all citizens at the North were substantially in agreement, as they were in 1861, it made little practical difference how these powers were exercised technically; but when Republicans and Democrats at the North resumed their old party lines, as they soon did resume them, the materials for difference of opinion quickly became national issues of vital importance. It was soon manifest that a misunderstanding on the part of citizens might become semi-treasonable opposition in conducting local parties, and might make State Legislatures practically hostile to the national Government.

It is equally obvious that as the contest advanced and thickened the functions of the leaders of these minor principalities would be amplified. The term "War Governor" grew naturally out of the situation. The name itself indicates that something had been added to the office as previously it had been known in the ordinary civic routine of the State. The Governors, indeed, were detached but assimilated War Ministers, wielding the resources of their several subsidiary Governments, not only in execution of the law, but by mustering all the powers of their respective States according to the needs and under the requisitions of the national Government. Our author, like all other students of the period, bears witness that in most instances their energies were unbounded, while their executive resource and tact were unfailing. Their intercourse with the President and the Federal departments, varying according to the characteristics of each individual, affords unquestionably interesting ground for retrospective study. To depict the interplay of these powerful practical men of affairs with the authorities at Washington is one of the principal aims of the book before us. Chief among the great personalities developed in the office of Governor were Morton, Andrew and Curtin, whose services were continuous throughout the war. To our author's mind the contrast between these personages and Horatio Seymour of New York recalls Milton's vision of Gabriel and Michael arrayed against Satan and Moloch, though he admits that the amiable Copperhead—so he chooses to call Seymour—lacked the force of the rebellious angels.

Although the purpose of this book is national, the scope is limited to four States, and those Northern. The author recognizes that there would have been advantages in including all of the States—Southern as well as Northern—within the range of his inquiry. So much detail, on the other hand, might have encumbered the main topic, which consists in the actual relations of a State, as such, to the central organ of all the States.

I.

In his first chapter Mr Weeden traces the growth of Union sentiment through its first adumbrations and symbolic images in colonial times to its inevitable manifestation in welding the States into a coherent whole after the revolutionary contest. He shows that the half century or more following the establishment of federal government under the Constitution of 1787 was dominated in the higher regions of popular politics more by sentiment than thought, more by feeling than opinion. Though John Quincy Adams, the "old man eloquent," might struggle manfully for the right of petition, the mass of the States, so long as the sway of Union was dormant, was drifting toward the new element of control exercised by slavery. Yet events were to prove that Webster's memorable phrase, "Keeping step to the music of the Union," whether or not he who uttered it measured its full significance, involved at once the inheritance of the past and the feeling of the moment. "The great ground swell of popular conviction invoked by this master of expression held the consciousness of the American people even while the process of disintegration wrought by slavery and cotton was going forward." That phrase of Webster's is pronounced "more than a figure of speech, inasmuch as it brought the average citizen into accord with a profound principle thoroughly in harmony with the creative forces of the State."

Our author finds it not surprising that philosophical publicists, foreign observers or sciolists could not comprehend the instinctive passion for the Union which, so far as the Northern States were concerned, had become the greatest of the forces that were building up the American nation. "They consulted constitutions, adjusted technical points, noted lapses and faults, thinking they had set forth the American future in the light of past experience. Generally, they predicted failure for Democracy in its American form. Fortuitous circumstances, as they claimed, had enabled an endogenous Government to maintain itself in the absence of hostility, and consequently, adverse conditions would bring disaster." The inner process sketched in the book before us lay beyond and beneath their ken. Who, indeed, previously to 1861-65, "could perceive the enormous forces, latent and mighty in a popular will, born out of the new conditions of America and trained by destiny to meet continental issues?"

In a footnote on page 34 we are reminded that Dr. Woodrow Wilson, in his "American People," says that in 1860 the South still adhered to the primary conception of the Union, which was that of a federation to which the parties had acceded voluntarily and from which, therefore, logically they could withdraw at will. Dr. Wilson goes on to say that, on the other hand, "for a majority of the nation no conception of the Union was now possible but that which Mr. Webster had seemed to create and bring once for all to their consciousness." Mr. Weeden concedes that Dr. Wilson's statements are always fair and entitled to consideration, but he stigmatizes the phrase "seemed to create" as an example of the process undergone by every intellect once befogged by slavery. The stigma is unwarranted. It would have been justified had Dr. Wilson credited Webster with the "creation" of the conception of the Union as indissoluble. He does nothing of the kind. He is careful to say "seemed to create," thereby marking sharply a distinction between the fact and the false impression of the fact produced on cursory observers. Dr. Wilson would be one of the first to answer in the negative our author's queries: "Could any philosopher or jurist, even a Webster, create such an overpowering force in government, the resultant sum of all the arts of civilization? Did Webster create the enormous power of Marshall, as brought by his tremendous reasoning force to the elucidation of the inevitable powers of government involved in the Union of the Constitution?" Dr. Wilson would doubtless be as willing as is Mr. Weeden to quote with implied approval the statement made by Thayer in his "Life of Marshall" that "Marshall included not only the powers expressed in the Constitution but those also which should be found, as time unfolded, to be fairly and clearly implied in the objects for which the Federal Government was established. It was Marshall's strong constitutional doctrine, explained in detail, elaborated, powerfully argued over and over again with unsurpassable earnestness and force, placed permanently in our judicial records, holding its own during the long emergence of a feeble political theory and showing itself in all its majesty when war and civil dissension came—it was largely this that saved the country from succumbing in the great struggle of forty years ago and kept our political fabric from going to pieces."

II.

In the interplay of Federal and State authorities during the civil war—an interplay which was to culminate in an assertion of the nation's supremacy over the constituent States and in the temporary conversion of the President into a dictator—the result, of course, obviously depended to a certain extent on the personal qualities of the Federal and State Executives. Our author's portraits of them are among the most striking and interesting features of his book. It may seem hard to say anything new of Abraham Lincoln, but Mr. Weeden certainly considers him from a new angle of vision. Thus, referring to Lincoln's almost complete lack of instruction, in the ordinary sense of the word, and the extreme paucity even of his opportunities for self-education, our author lays down a principle which, once propounded, will scarcely be contested, namely, that while libraries stimulate a book educates. All the mathematical training that Lincoln ever received he got for himself, when he found that he needed it in the work of land surveying. Six books of Euclid pored over and mastered in the intervals of physical labor "laid the foundations of a logic which could grapple with Taney or Douglas, Davis or Seward." The two books with which Lincoln was most thoroughly familiar were the Bible and Shakespeare. Touching this fact, our author suggests that though Lincoln may have been wanting in more direct acquaintance with the annals of Greece and Rome and with the lessons of European history, yet his intimate knowledge of Shakespeare in some measure corrected those defects.

Another discriminating touch in our author's portrait of Lincoln is his deprecation of the current description of him as a "witty man." Even Judge Douglas, who knew him so well, spoke of him as "full of wit." Our author is too keenly alive to the distinction between wit and humor to make such a mistake "The mind of Lincoln," he says, "seldom discharged wit. Such a mind did not work readily in that unhuman atmosphere, where hard gleams of truth are stricken forth as from flint, or steel, or diamond, or glass. That assemblage of ideas—whether in resemblance or contrast—the play of intellect, fascinating the great wits of the world, did not attract the Hoosier transferred to Illinois." Mr. Weeden goes on to suggest that "wit shocks, humor touches, our fellows and our kind. Humor penetrates the individual and the separable, outflowing into those humane currents of feeling, mournful or funny, where people unite and move onward into large streams of compassion. All true orators have something of this power of passion that fuses their individual hearers into a 'living sea of upturned faces,' but only statesmen who are also prophets can carry this momentary passion into the larger personality of their constituents." Emerson is quoted to much the same effect: "What an ornament and safeguard is humor! Far better than wit for a poet and writer. It is a genius itself, and so defends from the insanities." What follows will also be appreciated: "His judgment, the sum of all the faculties, was unerring where justice and the greater issues of life brought his ethical power into full play; but in the myriad affairs of life he was like an elephant picking up pins. His dull sensitivity and confessed want of taste left him senseless in the ordinary fitness of life." Our author considers that Herndon's close relations to Lincoln make his conclusions important as well as interesting. Herndon's summary of Lincoln's predominating qualities is, "first, his great capacity and power of reason; second, his conscience and his excellent understanding; third, an exalted idea of the sense of right and equity; fourth, his intense veneration of the true and the good." The estimate of Lincoln presented in this book closes appropriately with the tribute paid to him by Sir Edward Malet, who was secretary to Lord Lyons, British Minister at Washington during our civil war. "Abe Lincoln," says Malet, "was a great man—one whom the homely and loving appellation cannot belittle. Of all the great men I have known he is the one who has left upon me the impression of a sterling son of God. Straightforward, unflinching, not loving the work he had to do, but facing it with a bold and true heart; mild whenever he had a chance; stern as iron when the public weal required it, following a beeline to the good which duty set before him. I can still feel the grip of his massive hand and the searching look of his kindly eye."

III.

Let us turn to the author's conception of Oliver P. Morton, the War Governor of Indiana. Inaugurated Governor of that State in January, 1861, Morton was a typical child of a Western backwoods community. "Brought up by an old fashioned Scotch Presbyterian aunt until 15 years old, his heredity marked his early development. Strong, earnest, logical, reading widely and devouring the Bible by the way, he revolted from the narrow religious cult then prevailing in Indiana and became independent, as indicated by the well known term 'non-professor.' At some sacrifice, being intensely studious, he obtained a regular legal education, even attending school after his marriage. He was eloquent by sheer strength, a powerful and successful advocate." At first a Democrat, he helped in 1854 to organize the Republican party, and being possessed of unflinching courage and energy, of skill in handling men and of a clear perception of the impending issues, he became at 38 years of age the natural chieftain of the crisis, so far as Indiana was concerned. Hoar in his "Autobiography" has testified that as a party leader Morton had no superior in his time save Lincoln alone.

Mr. Weeden directs attention to the sharp and interesting contrast which Morton offers to Lincoln. Lincoln learned by heart six books, and these included Euclid, which furnished, as we have said, his penetrating and overwhelming logic. "No one, not even Webster, excelled him in the grasp of a perplexed question and in lucid power of statement." Morton, on the other hand, had the advantage of schools substantially good, and of such culture as prevailed among intelligent and simply educated people in his environment. "The minds of the men differed, and Morton's method was cyclopean. A voracious reader, he was fully armed, and could shatter his opponent's position with a single stroke. His own argument was not so succinct. He gathered materials in heaps, and did not build up a case with architectural development. Though the matter was exhausted when he had finished an argument, he did not leave the hearer entertaining a new and positive thing, an actual creation in place of the antecedent matter."

In his complete engrossment in his subjects our author discerns a phase of Morton's character wherein he differs from Lincoln. Morton was not self-conscious, but absorbed in the work of the moment, in the act of doing; he did not stand without and exploit the matter with a view to statement. This faculty made him the great Executive he was, and our author opines that if Lincoln had had something more of the same Napoleonic power of action it would have been a great boon to the American Executive. Lincoln, on the other hand, instead of simply transacting the business in hand, generally stood outside of it and employed himself in making a case which he could handle before the American people in a masterly manner. "Sincere in patriotic intent, he hardly ever lost himself in the force of creative action, whether manœuvring for a convention or laying plans for Congressional legislation. In the largest executive sense, the creative spirit, the eminent force of the imminent crises, did not enter into him and mould him to the work. Morton said to an immense multitude: 'I am not here to argue questions of State equality but to denounce treason and uphold the cause of the Union.' Such a speech naturally cleared the air." It seems to Mr. Weeden strange that Lincoln and Morton, bred in virtually the same way—though Morton was the more favored in early education—should have differed so much in their conceptions of the nature of the power required to subdue the rebellion. "Morton was in himself, by his own superior foresight and tremendous executive energy, the power needed for the occasion. Enough always meant for him the overwhelming heap which no bounding circumstance could render inadequate. The modicum of sense and quiet living can never be a revolutionary sufficiency. This appears in the swift recurring facts of the record, even more positively than can be stated now in sober words." That this overflowing patriotism did not exceed the limits of judgment seems to our author to be proved by the fact that the War Governor of Indiana maintained himself in his seat of authority throughout the most fiery opposition ever known under constitutional forms. "Morton was the embodiment of State support, of federate government incarnate in the immediate local representative of the people; not merely an instituted Executive, but a thinking, acting head."

It is on pages 191-3, in connection with the controversy that arose at a critical period of the war between Major-Gen. B. F. Butler and Gov. John A. Andrew, that a sketch of the latter's character will be found. We are told that the active "War Governor" of Massachusetts always rode into the lists of controversy with his visor up. "Careless of himself in every way, if he could strike for the right and the true, as he conceived it, ardently and vehemently, he laid himself open to any covert attack and any captious misconception. While his eager and restless conscientiousness endeared him to the inmost heart of the people, it severed him more or less from certain constant and constituent elements in the mass of the people, as this mass surged up to sustain and impel the State. The State is a body politic, both actual and moral; its Executive must bear all and forbear all." As Mr. Higginson, the military historian of Massachusetts, has testified, Andrew was frank and candid to a fault. "Concealing nothing himself, he was impatient of reserve in others. Overconscientious, he was thin skinned and could not bear an adverse criticism, however unscrupulous its motive." Higginson also concedes that Andrew made the worst mistakes in the selection of officers, "these mistakes arising almost wholly from his virtues." He could "not despise a man, poor, ignorant or black," but sometimes forgot that this sublime freedom from the practice of looking down on others was not transferable in the act of government to some applicant for office and might put the wrong man into place. Mr. Francis W. Bird, a capable man of affairs, member of the Executive Council and one of Andrew's intimate coadjutors, bears witness that the "War Governor" of Massachusetts was always his own master, and while yielding to men "superior to himself in practical capacity" was yet, in general policy, original and himself. "Yet he was diffuse, and amplified much in both thought and word, wasting energy and the precious moments of that crucial time. His great power in impromptu speaking tempted while it aided him in an utterance too free for incisive or intense expression."

Mr. Weeden recognizes that it was inevitable that a man of exuberant nature, in amplifying the state and the circumstances of the trying occasions amid which his lot was cast, should amplify himself officially. "One who knew Andrew thoroughly said that while democratic and absolutely sympathetic with the people, he enjoyed not the conscious pomp but the external parade incident to official life. When he sported the military cloak and white kid gloves at a Berkshire review he carried all official functions of the Executive into the gratification of the moment. His wife—excellent partner of his constant toil—with true feminine instinct went even further in appreciating official elevation." Light is thrown upon these minor details when we recall the social views prevailing in Massachusetts before and during the civil war. Abolitionists were beyond the pale. Charles Sumner, to whom so much attention had been paid in London, was tabooed in the higher circles of society in Boston. Our author mentions that "early in his official career Gov. Andrew with his wife was invited out by some people of fashion with the explanation, 'for you know you are about the only people who are willing to meet Mr. Sumner.'" Henry Lee, who was appointed on the Governor's staff early in January, 1861, has recorded: "If I, a radical, regarded Gov. Andrew with distrust, what was the horror and indignation excited in the hearts of conservatives at his accession to office?" We should not omit to note that to the executive ability exhibited by Andrew under the pressure of tremendous responsibilities our author willingly renders testimony. He points out that those nearest the Massachusetts Governor in his trying experience esteemed him highly. Gen. Schouler's tribute, for example, is reproduced: "The greatest, the wisest and noblest of Massachusetts Governors, he possessed transcendent genius as an executive officer, when those qualities could best be exercised."

There is reason to think that Andrew Gregg Curtin, the War Governor of Pennsylvania, had a more difficult part to play than either Morton or Andrew. The State had always claimed to be the keystone of the Union, but its people, greatly intermingled as they were in stocks of English, German, Swedish, Dutch and Irish blood, were slow of action. Moreover, by their location on the border between the free and the slave States, and by the antebellum affiliations of their trade, they had been inclined to sympathize with the South in the middle of the century. Not until the political campaigns of 1860 was the community stirred to its depths and made alive to the crisis. The man Curtin was fitted to the occasion which made him Governor. Born in the State and, according to his intimate associate, Col. A. K. McClure, of excellent Irish lineage, he had—so Mr. Egle, his biographer, testifies—"every quality for aggressive leadership. Of imposing person, impressive manner, capable of forceful logic mingled with the keenest wit and sarcasm and unsurpassed in eloquence, he was just the man to lead in a great revolution." An old Whig, he could bring into line Free Soilers and Know Nothings. Though a lawyer, he knew how to touch farmers and iron men, as well as the merchants and manufacturers of Philadelphia. In his own inaugural address, delivered two months before Lincoln's inauguration, he sounded the clear note: "The people mean to preserve the integrity of the national Union at every hazard." Our author conceives that possibly the position of his native State on the border inspired Curtin to a keener sense of responsibility and impelled him to forcible independent action; it was no secret that no sympathy existed between the War Governor of Pennsylvania and Simon Cameron, his fellow citizen, who was at the head of the War Department. According to Col. McClure the Secretary and the Governor were not friends because old political "wounds were yet fresh and excited the bitterest hostility." There is no doubt that every possible faculty of an Executive was needed in the Pennsylvania of those days. The community was rich, but the State credit had been shattered by the onset of war. To delicate problems of finance Gov. Curtin addressed himself with excellent sense. The necessity of watching great expending and disbursing officers is revealed in the appointment of a committee to supervise supplies and investigate frauds. Excessive vigilance was evinced by Curtin in caring for the soldiers in the field, and one of his especial delegates made himself felt throughout the hospials. On the whole, when his situation is considered, Curtin, considered as a War Governor, is here looked upon as fully the peer of Morton or of Andrew.

IV.

There is no doubt that the Governors of the great Commonwealths of Massachusetts, Pennsylvania and Indiana were in a very definite sense even greater Executives than the national President in the first two years of the civil war, or until after the Draft was thoroughly enforced. Of this state of things our author observes: "It ought not to have been so, but it was; the Governors furnished the raw materials for the new fabric that was weaving imperial textures. The lawyer politician from Illinois gradually grew into the statesman who marshalled the largest armies since Napoleon, freed millions of slaves, and finally wielded the powers eventually concentrated in the Federal Government so justly that few onlookers realized that they were in the hands of a necessary dictator." In 1861-62, however, the President of the republic exhibited no such executive force as Andrew, Curtin and Morton constantly exerted until the voluntary levies of their States were mustered into the Federal service. "Especially in the first year, they were the only War Ministers the country had, or could have until the pressure of affairs developed Stanton. Mr. Lincoln was worrying himself into exhaustion, running from one department to another—followed by troops of office seekers—and meddling conscientiously with details which should have been determined, for better or worse, by each master of his own bureau." Mr. Weeden does not mean to apply this criticism to Lincoln's enforced supervision of Generals in the field. "There was no actual leader of all the armies until Grant was evolved. The President honestly tried many, and found them wanting. Mere force of circumstances carried Lincoln to military headship." Our author is convinced that the more familiar we become with the secret history of the early years of the war the more distinctly is Lincoln revealed as, on the whole, a good leader—fair allowances being made for inevitable limitations.

Much time elapsed before Lincoln and those around him could perceive how far the sentiment of the people of the Northern States, or rather of a large majority of that people, had advanced toward putting the powers of administration into dictatorial form. It was unavoidable that, if the rebellion should not be subdued quickly, a larger and more efficient government would be evolved out of the exigencies of the war. As our author points out in a chapter devoted to some of the larger questions which grew out of the issues developed in the process of the contest: "After the great forces of the States—the individual Commonwealths—had been developed and concentrated, so that they merged in the larger Federal functions, there had to be adequate direction and government, something more than the mere administration of affairs from day to day. As the bounds of the struggle extended, and the great civic foundations of the republic began to be disturbed, a larger policy became inevitable. Then it was that the whole people of the North were brought under direct legislative and executive control by the Draft, and the government of the nation was consolidated at Washington."

In another chapter, entitled "The People Under Compulsion," we are reminded that the Secretary of War, in discussing the merits of the Draft in 1863, made no attempt to underrate the reluctance of the loyal States to accept conscription. On the contrary, he admitted that a large majority of citizens at first regarded it as "arbitrary and unjust." Yet, after the bureau had extended the enrolment and conscription throughout the country, its officials could say with truth that it had brought the Administration and people nearer together in prosecuting the war for the Union. In Mr Weeden's judgment "it was a severe but necessary process in the education of the people to the support of a well founded and powerful Government. The Administration, by direct demand on the resources of the nation, showed the necessity of the occasion; the people responded, though at first reluctantly, to the imperative need. There was a certain mutual confidence created, which, though constrained in the beginning, became a natural and proper bond between Government and people. The necessary effort of government—compulsory on the subsidiary rulers—when extended to the citizens through the Draft, was brought home to each individual, and became his own particular business." On the whole, our Draft is pronounced a great act of administration, executed as well as possible under the practical conditions prevailing at the time The involuntary recruiting, indirectly compelled by the conscription, and substituted for the previous spontaneous efforts of the States, reenforced effectually the armies. It is true that the great State of New York—badly led, and influenced as it was by some recalcitrant citizens—blundered and opposed; but it could not stop the progress of the Draft. In Pennsylvania, although a majority of the State Supreme Court enjoined on technical grounds the execution of the Federal requisition, the citizens would not obey the injunction, and thus stop the enforcement of the conscription. The great and, in view of the conditions, legitimate power of the Union, proved overwhelming in this function, as it proved in many another, and could not be controlled and thwarted by an array of legal quibbles. The enrolment showed that on April 30, 1865, besides 1,000,516 soldiers and officers actually in the field, there were at home 2,245,063 men fit for service. "The marvellous fact was revealed that, notwithstanding losses, there were more men properly subject to draft in the loyal States at the close of the rebellion than there were at its beginning. Immigration had prepared the way, while industrial invention and improvement had largely increased the product of each man at home." In the Confederacy, on the other hand, as early as April 30, 1864, the Bureau of Conscription at Richmond had reported that "fresh material for the armies" was no longer obtainable.

No one is likely to dispute the conclusion reached in the final chapter that "the Union was thoroughly established by the civil war, and its binding power immensely increased thereby. Possibly by no peaceful experience could the essential force of the democracy, working through Walt Whitman's units—masters in their own circles—have carried that mastering power through State and Federal relations into the larger articulations of the developed Union. War brought out all the latent powers of individuals in communities; these powers, becoming active, first impelled States and finally swept the Union itself into larger and wider operations."

The great constitutional problem, mooted in 1798 by the Kentucky and Virginia resolutions, has been worked out in the conflict of war, and through the consequent legislative and judicial acts. The State Rights doctrine, supported as it used to be by the antique social and the modern unsocial institution of slavery, was overcome by the theory of consolidated union which absorbed or subordinated many of the functions of particular States. "The whole State—the Union—inherited all the powers of civilization transmitted from centuries of tribal hordes, kingdoms and empires, from cities and republics. This historic evolution, including and embodying our civil war, cannot be studied too much or pondered too thoroughly. The past involves the future of a mighty commonwealth."

Mr. Weeden does but glance at the question whether it would have been better for civilization could the North have suppressed rebellion quickly and reestablished union in 1861-62 with a limited and regulated system of slavery instead of enforced and immediate emancipation. This problem is regarded as speculation pure and simple. The solution of it is pronounced beyond the ken of humankind. What is certain is that "never was a great emergency in history more fully developed and precipitated by the inexorable logic of events. Out of the agony of a nation divided against itself, out of the fiercest throes of battle came the freedom of the slave, for no one man decided the issue." To the same effect wrote Whittier in a letter here reproduced in a footnote to page 336. "The emancipation that came by military necessity and was enforced by bayonets was not the emancipation for which we [the Abolitionists] worked and prayed. But, like the Apostle, I am glad the Gospel of Freedom was preached, even if by strife and emulation. It cannot be said that we did it; we, indeed, had no triumph. But the work itself was a success." M. W. H.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

There has been no lack of books about the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, each viewed collectively, or about the best known of English public schools, including, of course, Eton and Winchester, which, technically, are not schools, but colleges. A "College Monographs" series has now been started, composed of volumes dealing separately with the colleges of the two universities just named. Each of these is to be written by members of the collegiate society with which it is concerned and is to aim at giving a concise description of the buildings, a recital of the origin and history of the community, an account of its collegiate manners and customs, both past and present, and a record of its distinguished sons. The introductory volume of the series is devoted to *Trinity College, Cambridge* (E. P. Dutton & Co.).

We need not remind any visitor to Oxford or Cambridge that no college pertaining to either university can vie for impressiveness or importance with Trinity College, Cambridge. It is possible, and even probable, that Christ Church, Oxford, would have done so but for Wolsey's untimely fall, for it is well known that a large part of the revenues intended by him for his own foundation at Oxford were diverted by his royal master to Trinity College in the sister university. When Henry VIII. in 1546 determined to establish a new college at Cambridge, the greater part of the area of the present Great Court was already occupied by two colleges known as King's Hall and Michael House. The King compelled the two societies to surrender to him their charters and buildings and acquired the other property on the site. He proceeded to endow Trinity College with the buildings and income yielding lands of the two bodies whose corporate life had been extinguished, additional revenues being transferred from religious houses recently dissolved.

There is reason to believe that the academic life of the students of King's Hall was not interrupted by the merger of that institution in a larger society, so that in fact the history of Trinity College goes back without a break to the days of Edward II. At first the members of King's Hall occupied hired houses, but they were established by Edward III. in the building known to Chaucer as Solar Hall. As this was built of wood the society in the last quarter of the fourteenth century erected more substantial structures. King's Hall was an aristocratic foundation, and, almost alone among mediæval colleges, did not require poverty as a qualification for membership. Michael House, the other establishment absorbed by Trinity College, was also founded in the reign of Edward II., but it was designed for the reception of a master and six poor scholars, and the members were required to be in orders within one year after their admission. The students of the two houses can have had but little in common.

Almost from the beginning the new college acquired the preponderance which it has since retained in the university. As early as 1564 about a quarter of the residents in Cambridge University were members of Trinity College. At present the proportion is about one to five. Thus in the Michaelmas term, 1905, the number of resident undergraduates, B. A.'s and higher graduates in Trinity College were respectively 568, 65 and 135, while the figures were but 2,835, 363 and 643 for the whole university.

The original statutes of Trinity College regulated the daily life of members in minute detail. An undergraduate was expected to rise at 4:30, and after saying his private prayers to attend chapel service at 5; he then adjourned to Hall for breakfast, during which meal Scripture was to be read and expounded. From 6 to 9 the lessons learned on the previous day had to be recited and those for the next day learned. The subjects of study at that date for undergraduates were Latin, mathematics, dialectics and philosophy, and for Bachelors philosophy, perspective, astronomy and Greek. At 9 the students were expected to proceed to the public "schools," so called, either to hear lectures or attend public disputations. Dinner was served at 11, and at 1 the students returned to attendance at the exercises of the schools. From 3 until 6 in the afternoon they were at liberty to pursue their amusements or their private studies; at 6 they supped in Hall, and immediately afterward were supposed to retire to their chambers; there was no evening service in ordinary days until the reign of James I.

By the reign of James I. and the Mastership of Thomas Nevile, the great reconstructor of the college architecturally—Whitgift, who was Master for ten years preceding 1577, had revolutionized the governing machinery of the university and enormously increased the powers of every college head—the manner of life at Trinity had come to differ in many respects from that of mediæval times. Externally, spacious courts and handsome buildings had replaced the small quadrangles and dingy hostels of the earlier period. The internal changes were even more important. Only a small proportion of students other than Fellows continued to reside after graduation. Undergraduates (scholars and pensioners) now formed the bulk of the residents, and at Trinity a considerable proportion were sons not of clergymen but of squires or merchants. The cost of the education of a pensioner at Trinity in the reign of James I. seems to have been about £45 a year. Boys were still sometimes admitted, but 16 was a not unusual age at which to commence residence. The actual instruction had by this time drifted into the hands of college officials, and university exercises and lectures were, with the exception of certain necessary "acts," neglected or treated as formalities. The tutorial system was similar to that now in force, except that any Fellow could, subject to the approval of the Master, take pupils. As to discipline, serious breaches of rules were punished, so far as non-adults were concerned, by corporal punishment, and the Dean attended in hall to see that the birch was applied to such students, and sometimes also to any lad who was beginning to show himself "too forward, pragmatic and conceited." The punishment of older students seems to have consisted for the most part of fines, impositions, being placed out of commons or being confined to the walls of the college, but occasionally an offender was carried ignominiously through the college on a "stang" or pole. In view of the part which Cambridge men were to play in the great rebellion it is to be noted that in the later years of Elizabeth and throughout the reign of James I. the civil and religious discussions of the day were keenly debated in Trinity College. The majority of the senior Fellows were moderate Anglicans, but many of the younger Fellows and undergraduates preferred a Presbyterian form of government.

Especially interesting is the record of Trinity's distinguished sons. During the early part of the seventeenth century the college seems to have been especially favored by prospective poets. Among these should be particularly mentioned George Herbert, Fellow from 1614 to 1628; Abraham Cowley, Scholar, 1637, and subsequently Fellow, and Andrew Marvel, another Scholar, who graduated B. A. in 1638. Dryden entered a few years later.

In 1642 the bulk of the college plate was sent to King Charles at his request, and the residue seems to have been forwarded early in 1644. The immediate and natural effect of the gift was the ejection of the Master and Fellows responsible for it; this was followed later by the removal of forty-two more Fellows. Throughout the subsequent Commonwealth period most of the Fellowships were filled by Parliament or Cromwell, and rather as a reward for political zeal than for learning. Under the circumstances, the college fell into eclipse. The revival of learning at Trinity after the Restoration was encouraged by the presence of Pearson, the eminent divine, and Barrow, whose fame as a preacher and mathematician still survives. Barrow's teaching will always be memorable from the fact that it was under him that Isaac Newton, who entered Trinity in 1661, studied mathematics. Newton's manuscripts show that in 1665, the year in which he took his B. A. degree, he discovered the binomial theorem and had already invented fluxions. His theory of gravitation, his optical investigations and other researches followed at no wide interval; the "Principia," however, was not finally published till 1687. He resided continuously in the college till 1696. From 1700 to 1742 the Mastership of Trinity was held by Richard Bentley, whose writings are justly reckoned among the glories of Cambridge scholarship. Of Bentley's learning no one was better qualified to form an opinion than Porson, who said: "When I was seventeen I thought I knew everything; as soon as I was twenty-four and had read Bentley I found I knew nothing."

It was in 1790 that a system of annual college examinations was introduced, and this reform was followed in 1810 by the rule that undergraduates should be required to pass an entrance examination before taking up their abode in college. At this time prominent residents in college were Porson, who was elected to a Fellowship in 1782, and subsequently held the Greek chair, and Mansell, Master from 1798 to 1820. The same period is notable for the large number of eminent Judges educated at Trinity. Among these were John Singleton Copley (Lord Lyndhurst), J. Park (Lord Wensleydale), F. Pollock, W. H. Maule and R. M. Rolfe (Lord Cranworth). It has been thought that the strict training in geometry and formal logic then enforced at Cambridge on all candidates for high academic honors was favorable to the development of legal talent.

Mansell was succeeded in the Mastership by Christopher Wordsworth, brother of the poet. Under his reign the conspicuous Fellows of Trinity were A. Sedgwick, the geologist; G. Peacock, the mathematician; Julius C. Hare and C. Thirlwall, the well known scholars, and G. B. Airy, the astronomer. It would, as the author of this monograph says, be difficult to exaggerate the influence of such men on the intellectual life of the college. A few years later the undergraduate society of Trinity comprised a memorable group, including R. C. Trench (afterward Archbishop of Dublin), W. M. Thackeray, Edward Fitzgerald, Monckton Milnes (Lord Houghton), James Spedding (the biographer of Bacon), A. H. Hallam, A. W. Kinglake (the historian), Alfred, Charles and Frederick Tennyson, and W. H. Thompson, who was to succeed Whewell as Master of the college. T. B. Macaulay, Fellow in 1824, was of somewhat earlier date.

Dr. Whewell was appointed by the Prime Minister Master of Trinity in 1840, and retained the office until 1866. There is no doubt that his intellectual powers and knowledge were immense. That he was a bit too conscious of the fact, however, was attested in the once familiar saying that science was his forte, but omniscience his foible.

In 1870 the biological and medical schools of Cambridge received a considerable stimulus from the appointment by Trinity College of a prælector in physiology. This was only one aspect of an activity which affected all studies. Under Clerk Maxwell, Lord Rayleigh and J. J. Thomson the School of Mathematical and Experimental Physics was greatly developed, while the names of Munro and Jebb in classics, of Jackson in Greek philosophy, of Sidgwick in ethics and of Westcott, Lightfoot and Hort in theology are widely known. All of these were Fellows of Trinity College.

COSTLY CHURCHES.

Trinity's Value Put at $12,500,000, Including Land—Cathedral Worth $6,000,000.

Trinity Church is valued at $12,500,000. This estimate includes the land occupied by the churchyard. It is in the most valuable part of New York, if not in the most valuable division of property in the world.

St. Paul's Church is valued at $5,500,000.

Grace Church, at what was once described as the head of Broadway, is valued at $950,000.

The First Presbyterian Church, on Fifth avenue between Eleventh and Twelfth streets, is valued at $750,000.

St. Mark's Church, on Second avenue, an old landmark in that neighborhood, is valued at $275,000.

The Marble Collegiate Church, Fifth avenue and Twenty-ninth street, is valued at $1,000,000.

The Church of St. Paul the Apostle (the Paulist Church), at Fifty-ninth street and Columbus avenue, is valued at $700,000.

The West Presbyterian Church, on West Forty-second street, is valued at $450,000. St. Thomas's at $1,700,000 and the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, 9 and 11 West Fifty-fifth street, at $1,600,000.

The valuation of the Temple Emanu-El is $1,530,000, of St. Patrick's Cathedral $6,000,000, of the B'nai Jeshurun Synagogue $300,000, of the Temple Beth-El, at the corner of Fifth avenue and Seventy-sixth street, $1,300,000; of the Broadway Tabernacle, Broadway and Fifty-sixth street, $700,000, and of the Christian Scientist Church, Central Park West and Sixty-eighth street, $300,000.

THE JEWISH MARK TWAIN.

Sholem Aleichem Is Coming to America—Something About His Career.

Sholem Aleichem is the *nom de guerre* of a Russian Jew whose writings have gained him the title of "the Jewish Mark Twain."

He is a benefactor of his people, says the London *Jewish Chronicle*, because he has lightened their misery in Galicia with the magic of his wit and made the Pale of Settlement laugh between its tears.

No one has caught more faithfully or reproduced with more subtle truth the ironic humor with which the Jew looks out on a world in arms, and no one has portrayed more delightfully the comical side of Russo-Jewish character and life.

Few men have suffered more vicissitudes: he has approached both extremes of fortune.

Born in 1859 near Kief—his real name is Salomon Rabinowicz—he was trained in early years for the rabbinate. Before he could consummate his plans the young man had fallen in love and married, and that was the end of his university dreams. The student went into business and soon lost both the dowry of his wife and her inheritance. In 1890 came the commercial crash and Sholem Aleichem went over, bag and baggage, to literature.

The year 1904 found Sholem Aleichem touring Russia, with the Jewish population at his feet. A Zionist society had invited him to give a reading from his works in aid of some charity. The reading was such a success that similar invitations poured in from all parts of Russia, and presently Rabinowicz was travelling from city to city, filling the coffers of various institutions but getting not a kopeck for himself out of it all.

In the following year (1905) Sholem Aleichem began to think of his own concerns. The Russian Government had given permission for Yiddish drama to be staged, and the author seized the opportunity to enter into a contract in Odessa by virtue of which he was to write original plays and adapt the plays of others. Rabinowicz also obtained permission to start a Yiddish daily paper, but the great November pogroms shattered these schemes.

When the rioting began he and his family abandoned their house to the mob and fled for their lives to a certain hotel whereof a gentile was the proprietor. For three nights and two days they remained concealed in a garret, neither eating nor sleeping, while Russian hooliganism raged in the streets below.

When the massacre was at an end Rabinowicz remained in Kief just long enough to obtain a pass, and then, with his family, crossed the frontier and set his face westward. In America Rabinowicz intends to give readings from his works, which are already being arranged, and to write for the Yiddish theatre.